Case 1:06-cv-00708 MATHER LABORATION STATES TO POST She Middle District of alabama The Northern Division

Ralph Wilson Lingo,

Petitioner

V. Willie R. Collins, Respondent 1:06-CV-703-MHT

## Anendment 20 Original Habeas Corpus Petition

Comes now your Petitioner, Ralph Wilson Fingo, pro se, and would pubmit his amended petition pursuant to Rule 15(a) Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, as well as to meet the mandates of Rule 7(6X1), 7(6)(2) along with Rules 10(a) and 11(a) Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Petitioner would make a request of the Honorable Court to allow an "Expantion of Pecord" as is at the Courts descretion under 28 U.S. C. § 2254 Rule Kb), refering to materials to be added as is allowed under rule 76). By inclusion of additional materials rel-livent to the determination of the merits of the petition. Petitioner would include letters predating the filing of the petition in the District Court, documents, exhibits, and answers by way of affidavits in order to

to support his claims, as well as to show Cause for his reply to Respondents "answer" as being in error of it's contentions and positions.

1) your Petitioner wouldadd the state officer of Autouga County Sheriff James Herbie Johnson, who is currently the custodian of Petitioner, he has maintained custody of Petitioner since the august 10, 2006 transfer from his pre-trial federal holding at the Montgomery City Jail, to the Autauga Metro Jail, located in Prattville, alabama. Peti-Lioner does so to meet the requirements of Rule 2(a) Rules Governing Proceedings in United States District Court 28 U.S.C. # 32254 Petitionen would request that Respondent Willie R. Collins, Warden of the Montgomery City Jail, be forever expunged from the records of the habeas petition as chief Respondant in the instant case at tar, and be explaced by Sheriff James "Herbee" Johnson.

2.) Potitioner would request that his second claim he made in his original habeas petition where he alleges that his home was illegally siezed, and his property illegally siezed, be dismissed with prejudice by the Honorable District lower, due to it being of no merit as it.

Itimidating a Witness.

3.) Your Petitioner would request that the Honorable Court dismiss his third contention alleged in his original habeas corpus petition regarding ineffective assistance of coursel, wherein he contends that because of her failing to have challenged the legality of the search of his home by an officer acting outside his jurisdiction, failed to visit him in order to prepare a defense, failed to argue the legality of the search warrant, failed to challenge the fact that he was held in the District Court Dothan City sail for five days without a first applanance, prevented him from calling her be-cause the had put a block on her phone, allowed him to be questioned by police over 10 times in her absence, and incouraged him to plead quilty to a charge for which he was not quilty of by telling him the could get a good deal", because these claims are not german and of no merit to his conviction of Intimidating a Witness.
Petitioner would perserve his contentions of ineffections assistance of coursel due to her not having outpoinced the witnesses that he had requested her to call that he raised in his original claim. He would add her representation as being ireffective due to her failure to question his common law wife of their com-

Common law marriage which would have brought the common law rule of one spouse not testifying against the other, her failure to properly object to the state Irial Court's not instructing on the lesser included offense of Criminal Gercion, and Jampering with a Witness. That she failed to question the Houston County Police Detective about his arresting Petitioner in Henry County without having first domesticated the warrant. That she was so inexperienced as a trial attorney that her questioning of the states witnesses brought about responses that were prejudicial to him, and finally that her representation was so deficient as to have prejudiced him.

4.) Your Petitioner would also preserve his fourth contention wherein he dated that he should have been charged with harassing a witness instead of intimedating a witness, however, he would clarify what he was attempting to convey when he dictated his position to his previous inmate legal assistants while listing his claims within listing his claims within the 28 U.S.C. \$ 2254 form provided him by the U.S. District Court Clerk.

4(a). Due to Petitioner having a speech impediment, as well as possessing a fifth grade education, along with being illiterate,

it is extremely difficult for him to convey exactly what he means when he is orally dictating his contentions to those inmates he plight to seek relief from his state court conviction, therefore many of his claims were either completely omitted by those assisting him, or more so than not, misinterpreted what he was saying therefore losing. Petitioner's true meaning in their translations. Infact it has been extremely difficult for present assistant to understand what Peti-tioner is trying to explain. Certainly it is easily understood how those previously assisting him, who have no knowledge of even common law, could unintentionally, by excusable reglect omitt or fail to make known a legally metitable claim of Constitutional wrong doings by a state court. It would therefore be tremendously unfair to not allow Petitioner to amend his original claims of wrong doings of a state court, law enforcement, and appointed counsel, by way of habeas corpus. For to refuse his amended claims would preclude Politioner. from the one shot at relief that Congress in-tended him to have by way of the Great Writ"

4(6) Petitioner would clarify his claim

regarding his fourth contention made in his original polition. Politioner was trying to convey the fact that he should have been found guilty of lither of the lesser included offenses of concion of a witness or Dampering of a witness rather than being found quilty of the Intimi-dating a witness, and it is his contention that had the jury been so instructed on the lesser included offenses then the outcome of his trial would likely have blen different; therefore he was prejudiced by the Drial Court's refusal to instruct the jury accordingly thereby violating his Sixth and Seventh amendments to a fair trial.

5.) Petitioner would add a claim of constitutional violations of the court having allowed his commonlaw wife to testify against him as such testimony is protected from one spouse testifying against the other by the common law forfidding such testimony. Therefore Petitioner would contend his sixth and Seventh amendment rights to a fair trial

Were violated by the Drial Court.

6) Petitioner would add a claim of his constitution right to not self incriminate himself as protected by the Fifth amendment, having been violated by the state court and having allowed his statements made to an

Investigan of the alabama Department of Corrections to be put before the jury, when such statement had been made outside the presence of his attorney. Petitioner would contend that his Fourteenth amendment right to due process of law was also violated by such statements made outside the presence of his counsel to be brought before jury. He would also contend that the testimony of this Investigator being allowed by the Drial Court was a violation of his Sixth amendment and Seventh amendment right to a fair trial.

2) Petitioner would over that his 20 year sentence was excessive, and that it was illegally enhanced by the Drial Courts having had his past misdemeanor offenses; as well as past charges he had been found not guilty of, along with a case that had been neversed, and hendered by the ala-bama Criminal Court of appeals, and charges which had not been adjudicated, to be brought before the court by the state prosecutor to be hat Petitioner would be sentenced under the Habitual offender actions by the state prosecutor dripped of prosecutorial misconduct and plainly violated not only Petitioner's

Document 18

Constitutional rights but was a violation of the alabama constitution, as well as the alabama Rules of Criminal Procedure, 1975. Only felony convictions can be used to enhance purishment, therefore Petitioner's Dentence was illegally had by the State Drial Court.

8.) Petitioner would add the claim of his correct being illegal in that he was arrested in Henry County, alabama by a Police Detective out of Dothan, alabama, which is Houston Country, therefore Petitioner was illegally arrested because the Police officer failed to domesticate the warrant and was outside his jurisdiction to serve a warrant or make an arrest.

9.) Your Petitioner would over that the Honorable U.S. District Court should accept his amended complaint due to doing otherwise would preclude him from his one shot at federal relief by way of habeas corpus in which Congress intended he have.

Wherefore These Premises Considered, Petitioner would pray that the Honorable Coust would accept his amended petition and order he be given this request, as well as any other relief the Court deems available to him. Gor shis we forever Pray.

## Done this the 2nd day of October, 2006

Mailed this the 16th day of October, 2006

Respectfully Submitted, Ralph Wilson Lingo Petitionen 136 North Court Street Prattville, Alabama 34067

Page 9 of 9

Laphwison Lingo, do hereby certificated that I have delivered a copy of the foregoing motion along with it's attachments to the Office of the Clerk for the United States District lower by placing the same in the V.S. mail properly addressed to Mrs. Debra Hackett-Clerk's Office. P.O. Box 711 Montgomery, Clatama 36/01-0711 with proper postage prepaid and affixed this the 16th day of October, 2006.

I have also served the Respondants by placing the copy of the same in the U.S. mail %. Ottorney General's Office. Alabama State House 11 South Union Street. Montgomery, Alabama this the 16 day of October, 2005.

Kalph Wilson Lingo Petitioner